

Later he was one of the 189 defenders of the Alamo, and his life was spared by Colonel William Travis' decision to send him with a request for reinforcements to Colonel James Fannin at Goliad, Texas.

He left on March 5, 1836, the day before the fall of the Alamo and the slaughter of its defenders.

He was able to rejoin the remainder of the Texas Army under General Sam Houston, and thus became the only man to fight at both the Alamo and San Jacinto.

Juan Seguin was a legendary leader in the Texas Revolution and an unsung hero of Texas. Though he is seldom given credit for his contributions, he helped establish the Texas that we are so proud of today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

#### STATEMENT AGAINST A PREVENTIVE WAR IN IRAQ

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 7, 2003*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, literally on the eve of our swearing in as members of the 108th Congress, I spoke in Wellesley, Massachusetts at the Unitarian Universalist Society of Wellesley Hills at the invitation of that society. The topic they asked me to address was the potential war in Iraq, and I spoke to a crowd of several hundred people expressing my reasons for opposing a war in Iraq at this time. I was struck by the extremely large turnout—overflowing the hall—on a weeknight, and on a day when there had been a significant snowstorm, leaving the roads in difficult condition.

At the conclusion of the question and answer period, a representative of the society presented me with the attached statement, signed by approximately 160 people in the group. (I should note that the attendance at the meeting was much larger because not everyone who attended had been previously solicited to sign the statement.)

Mr. Speaker, given the grave nature of the question of whether or not to go to war, and the strong interest expressed by these citizens, I welcome their contribution to our debate and I ask that the Statement Against A Preventive War In Iraq presented by Members and Friends of the Unitarian Universalist Society of Wellesley Hills be printed here.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE PUSH POLL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2003

**HON. THOMAS E. PETRI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 7, 2003*

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to increase the disclosure requirements for telephone "push polls." As many candidates for public office have learned through personal experience, these push polls are not legitimate telephone surveys, but campaign devices designed to smear a candidate under the guise of a standard opinion poll.

Imagine a voter, who has been identified as a supporter of candidate X, being asked in a

survey if this support would continue if it was learned that candidate X was guilty of a terrible indiscretion or an outright crime. It doesn't matter whether the allegations are true because the idea that candidate X is somehow unfit for office has been planted successfully. This is a telephone push poll.

My legislation, the Push Poll Disclosure Act of 2003, requires that each participant in a poll conducted for a candidate for a Federal office seeking the opinion of more than 1,200 households be told the identity of the survey's sponsor. It also requires further disclosures when a survey's results are not to be released to the public. In this case, the cost of the poll and the sources of its funding must be reported to the Federal Election Commission, along with a count of the households contacted and a transcript of the questions asked.

The Push Poll Disclosure Act of 2003 is a simple bill. It will not hinder the traditional use of polling, nor will it burden polling firms with excessive regulations. What this bill does do, however, is regulate push polls for what they are—campaign activities, and questionable ones at that. This legislation is noncontroversial and should be bipartisan, and its passage will make campaigns for Federal office a little bit cleaner.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE FED UP HIGHER EDUCATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2003

**HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 7, 2003*

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleague from California, the Chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, Representative HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, in reintroducing the FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act. This bipartisan bill, cosponsored by Education & the Workforce Democrat committee members CAROLYN MCCARTHY (D-NY) and DAVID WU (D-OR), provides for technical amendments to the Higher Education Act, which will be up for reauthorization later this year.

Representative MCKEON, a leader in the House on higher education issues, along with the late Representative Patsy Mink (D-HI), initiated the FED UP process to make it easier for Hispanic-Serving Institutions to receive Federal aid, help college students avoid defaulting on their student loans, clarify that Federal scholarship aid can go to low-income and minority students for law school, and improve higher education access in other ways recommended by the higher education community.

The FED UP project is a unique effort, utilizing the Internet to get input directly from those most affected by current Federal higher education regulations—students and school officials themselves. The project solicited comments from student aid professionals from across the country in an effort to pinpoint unnecessary Federal rules and red tape that could be streamlined without jeopardizing the integrity of America's student financial assistance programs.

The response was phenomenal, both in terms of the number of comments received and in the reaction from the higher education

community. Many of those responding commented that this is the first time Congress has put forward an effort to hear directly from those on the front lines of assisting students. Another said this is the way government should work, Congress listening to the experts and getting input, rather than just dictating a course of action. This bill is intended to address noncontroversial, budget neutral changes to the Higher Education Act that will assist in reducing red tape. It also clears the decks of clerical and technical problems within the act to set the stage for the Committee to begin the reauthorization process later this year.

This year I hope we can move this legislation through the floor in a swift manner. As part of an ongoing election-year effort to disrupt proceedings in the House, Democrat leaders in July 2002 blocked floor passage of the noncontroversial, bipartisan FED UP initiative. Twenty-seven House Democrats, including the late Representative Patsy Mink, broke with the Democratic leadership and joined Republicans in voting "yes" on the measure, which is also strongly backed by the higher education community.

This legislation was created in an effort to do what is right for students, institutions and others involved in providing higher education. The FED UP measure will help to untie the hands of students and institutions through a series of common-sense steps that will make a difference while paving the way for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in the 108th Congress.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE FED UP HIGHER EDUCATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2003

**HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 7, 2003*

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to join my colleague, the Chairman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, John Boehner, in introducing the FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2003. This legislation is the result of a great deal of effort to improve the efficiencies and effectiveness of the Title IV student aid programs through the review of overly burdensome and outdated regulations.

During the 107th Congress, the House Education and the Workforce Committee launched the FED UP project (short for "Upping the Effectiveness of our Federal Student Aid Programs") to identify and simplify burdensome regulations in the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) that work against college students and personnel. The initiative, which was started to bring some sense to the regulations that students and the higher education community must deal with on a daily basis, received over 3,000 responses from college officials, administrators and other personnel who operate America's institutions of higher learning. After all of the responses were catalogued, the Department of Education initiated a negotiated rulemaking process to consider the regulatory changes included in the project, and have since published final regulations implementing many of the FED UP proposals.

These proposed amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 continue this effort to